




2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for Adrian College. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY:  Highest  Mean  Lowest

2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY

0

2015 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE

2015 Performance Category & Phase


SATISFACTORY

0

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Adrian College



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates

Abbreviated SURV on this report

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores

Abbreviated EFF on this report

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who

received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs.

To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:

Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Weight for Goal 1	Weight for Goal 2	Weight for Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30

2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for Albion College. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY

0

2015 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE

2015 Performance Category & Phase


SATISFACTORY

0

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Albion College



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates

Abbreviated SURV on this report

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores

Abbreviated EFF on this report

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who

received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs.

To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:




Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Weight for Goal 1	Weight for Goal 2	Weight for Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30

2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for Alma College. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY:  Highest  Mean  Lowest

2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY

0

2015 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE

2015 Performance Category & Phase


SATISFACTORY

0

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Alma College



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates

Abbreviated SURV on this report

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores

Abbreviated EFF on this report

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who

received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs.

To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:




Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Weight for Goal 1	Weight for Goal 2	Weight for Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30

2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for Andrews University. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY:  Highest  Mean  Lowest

2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY

0

2015 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE

2015 Performance Category & Phase


SATISFACTORY

0

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Andrews University



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content/subject areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content/subject-area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who

received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs. To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

- 1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
- 2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
- 3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:

Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Weight for Goal 1	Weight for Goal 2	Weight for Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30

2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for Aquinas College. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY

0

2015 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE

2015 Performance Category & Phase


SATISFACTORY

0

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Aquinas College



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates

Abbreviated SURV on this report

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores

Abbreviated EFF on this report

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who

received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs.

To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:

Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Weight for Goal 1	Weight for Goal 2	Weight for Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30

2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for Baker College. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY

1

2015 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE

2015 Performance Category & Phase


SATISFACTORY

0

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Baker College



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content/subject areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content/subject-area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who

received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs. To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

- 1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
- 2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
- 3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:

Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Weight for Goal 1	Weight for Goal 2	Weight for Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30

2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for Calvin College. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY

0

2015 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE

2015 Performance Category & Phase


SATISFACTORY

0

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Calvin College



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content/subject areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content/subject-area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who

received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs.

To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:

Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Weight for Goal 1	Weight for Goal 2	Weight for Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30

2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for Central Michigan University. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY

0

2015 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE

2015 Performance Category & Phase


SATISFACTORY

0

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Central Michigan University



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates
Abbreviated SURV on this report

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores
Abbreviated EFF on this report

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who

received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs.

To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

- 1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
- 2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
- 3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:

Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Weight for Goal 1	Weight for Goal 2	Weight for Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30

2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for Concordia University. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2014 Performance Category & Phase

AT RISK OF LOW PERFORMING 3

2015 STATUS: DID NOT MEET CUT SCORE


2015 Performance Category & Phase

LOW PERFORMING 4

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as LOW PERFORMING exhibits most or all of the following:

- a low percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates report a low level of satisfaction with their teacher preparation and clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the negative perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who earn many Ineffective or Minimally Effective ratings, and generally no Highly Effective ratings, during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Concordia University



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content/subject areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content/subject-area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who

received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs.

To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:

Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Weight for Goal 1	Weight for Goal 2	Weight for Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30

2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for Cornerstone University. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY

0

2015 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE

2015 Performance Category & Phase


SATISFACTORY

0

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Cornerstone University



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content/subject areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content/subject-area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who

received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs. To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

- 1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
- 2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
- 3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:

Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Weight for Goal 1	Weight for Goal 2	Weight for Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30

2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for Eastern Michigan University. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY

0

2015 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE

2015 Performance Category & Phase


SATISFACTORY

0

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Eastern Michigan University



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates

Abbreviated SURV on this report

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores

Abbreviated EFF on this report

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who

received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs.

To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:

Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Weight for Goal 1	Weight for Goal 2	Weight for Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30

2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for Ferris State University. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY

1

2015 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE

2015 Performance Category & Phase


SATISFACTORY

0

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Ferris State University



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates

Abbreviated SURV on this report

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores

Abbreviated EFF on this report

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who

received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs.

To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:

Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Weight for Goal 1	Weight for Goal 2	Weight for Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30

2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for Grand Valley State University. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY

0

2015 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE

2015 Performance Category & Phase


SATISFACTORY

0

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Grand Valley State University



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates

Abbreviated SURV on this report

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores

Abbreviated EFF on this report

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who

received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs.

To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:




Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Weight for Goal 1	Weight for Goal 2	Weight for Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30

2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for Hope College. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY:  Highest  Mean  Lowest

2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY

0

2015 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE

2015 Performance Category & Phase


SATISFACTORY

0

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Hope College



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates

Abbreviated SURV on this report

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores

Abbreviated EFF on this report

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who

received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs.

To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:

Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Weight for Goal 1	Weight for Goal 2	Weight for Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30

2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for Lake Superior State University. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY

0

2015 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE

2015 Performance Category & Phase


SATISFACTORY

0

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Lake Superior State University



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content/subject areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content/subject-area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who

received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs.

To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:




Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Weight for Goal 1	Weight for Goal 2	Weight for Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30

2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for Madonna University. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY:  Highest  Mean  Lowest

2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY

0

2015 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE

2015 Performance Category & Phase


SATISFACTORY

0

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Madonna University



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates

Abbreviated SURV on this report

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores

Abbreviated EFF on this report

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who

received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs.

To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:




Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Weight for Goal 1	Weight for Goal 2	Weight for Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30

2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for Marygrove College. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY:  Highest  Mean  Lowest

2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY

1

2015 STATUS: DID NOT MEET CUT SCORE

2015 Performance Category & Phase


AT RISK OF LOW PERFORMING

2

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as AT RISK OF LOW PERFORMING exhibits one or more of the following:

- a relatively low percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report relatively lower levels of satisfaction with their teacher preparation and clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the negative perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who earn few Ineffective or Minimally Effective, and generally no Highly Effective ratings, during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Marygrove College



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates
Abbreviated SURV on this report

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores
Abbreviated EFF on this report

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who

received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs.

To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

- 1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
- 2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
- 3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:

Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Weight for Goal 1	Weight for Goal 2	Weight for Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30

2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for Michigan State University. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY

0

2015 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE

2015 Performance Category & Phase


SATISFACTORY

0

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Michigan State University



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates
Abbreviated SURV on this report

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores
Abbreviated EFF on this report

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who

received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs.

To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

- 1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
- 2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
- 3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:

Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Weight for Goal 1	Weight for Goal 2	Weight for Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30

2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for Michigan Technological University. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY

0

2015 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE

2015 Performance Category & Phase


SATISFACTORY

0

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Michigan Technological University



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content/subject areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content/subject-area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who

received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs. To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

- 1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
- 2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
- 3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:

Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Weight for Goal 1	Weight for Goal 2	Weight for Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30

2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for Northern Michigan University. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY

0

2015 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE

2015 Performance Category & Phase


SATISFACTORY

0

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Northern Michigan University



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content/subject areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content/subject-area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who

received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs. To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

- 1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
- 2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
- 3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:

Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Weight for Goal 1	Weight for Goal 2	Weight for Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30

2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for Oakland University. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY

0

2015 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE

2015 Performance Category & Phase


SATISFACTORY

0

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Oakland University



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates
Abbreviated SURV on this report

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores
Abbreviated EFF on this report

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who

received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs.

To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

- 1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
- 2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
- 3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:



Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Weight for Goal 1	Weight for Goal 2	Weight for Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30

2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for Olivet College. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY:  Highest  Mean  Lowest

2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY

0

2015 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE

2015 Performance Category & Phase


SATISFACTORY

0

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Olivet College



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates

Abbreviated SURV on this report

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores

Abbreviated EFF on this report

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who

received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs.

To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:




Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Weight for Goal 1	Weight for Goal 2	Weight for Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30

2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for Robert B. Miller College. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY:  Highest  Mean  Lowest

2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY

0

2015 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE

2015 Performance Category & Phase


SATISFACTORY

0

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Robert B. Miller College



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates
Abbreviated SURV on this report

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores
Abbreviated EFF on this report

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who

received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs.

To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

- 1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
- 2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
- 3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:




Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Weight for Goal 1	Weight for Goal 2	Weight for Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30

2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for Rochester College. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY:  Highest  Mean  Lowest

2014 Performance Category & Phase

AT RISK OF LOW PERFORMING 3

2015 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE


2015 Performance Category & Phase

AT RISK OF LOW PERFORMING 2

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as AT RISK OF LOW PERFORMING exhibits one or more of the following:

- a relatively low percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report relatively lower levels of satisfaction with their teacher preparation and clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the negative perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who earn few Ineffective or Minimally Effective, and generally no Highly Effective ratings, during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Rochester College



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates
Abbreviated SURV on this report

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores
Abbreviated EFF on this report

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who

received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs.

To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

- 1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
- 2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
- 3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:

Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Weight for Goal 1	Weight for Goal 2	Weight for Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30


2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for Saginaw Valley State University. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

Saginaw Valley State University



KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY

0

2015 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE

2015 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY

0

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates

Abbreviated SURV on this report

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores

Abbreviated EFF on this report

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who

received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs.

To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:




Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Weight for Goal 1	Weight for Goal 2	Weight for Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30

2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for Siena Heights University. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY:  Highest  Mean  Lowest

2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY

0

2015 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE

2015 Performance Category & Phase


SATISFACTORY

0

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Siena Heights University



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates
Abbreviated SURV on this report

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores
Abbreviated EFF on this report

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who

received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs.

To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

- 1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
- 2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
- 3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:

Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Weight for Goal 1	Weight for Goal 2	Weight for Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30

2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for Spring Arbor University. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY

0

2015 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE

2015 Performance Category & Phase


SATISFACTORY

0

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Spring Arbor University



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates
Abbreviated SURV on this report

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores
Abbreviated EFF on this report

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who

received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs.

To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

- 1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
- 2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
- 3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:

Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Weight for Goal 1	Weight for Goal 2	Weight for Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30


2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for University of Michigan – Ann Arbor. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

Univ. of Michigan – Ann Arbor



2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY

0

2015 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE

2015 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY

0

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates
Abbreviated SURV on this report

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores
Abbreviated EFF on this report

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who

received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs.

To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

- 1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
- 2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
- 3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:




Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Weight for Goal 1	Weight for Goal 2	Weight for Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30

2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for University of Michigan – Dearborn. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY:  Highest  Mean  Lowest

2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY

0

2015 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE

2015 Performance Category & Phase


SATISFACTORY

0

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Univ. of Michigan – Dearborn



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates

Abbreviated SURV on this report

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores

Abbreviated EFF on this report

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who

received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs.

To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:

Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Weight for Goal 1	Weight for Goal 2	Weight for Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30

2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for University of Michigan – Flint. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2014 Performance Category & Phase

AT RISK OF LOW PERFORMING 3

2015 STATUS: DID NOT MEET CUT SCORE


2015 Performance Category & Phase

LOW PERFORMING 4

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as LOW PERFORMING exhibits most or all of the following:

- a low percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates report a low level of satisfaction with their teacher preparation and clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the negative perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who earn many Ineffective or Minimally Effective ratings, and generally no Highly Effective ratings, during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Univ. of Michigan – Flint



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates

Abbreviated SURV on this report

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores

Abbreviated EFF on this report

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who

received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs.

To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:




Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Weight for Goal 1	Weight for Goal 2	Weight for Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30

2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for University of Detroit Mercy. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY:  Highest  Mean  Lowest

2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY

0

2015 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE

2015 Performance Category & Phase


SATISFACTORY

0

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

University of Detroit Mercy



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates
Abbreviated SURV on this report

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores
Abbreviated EFF on this report

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who

received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs.

To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

- 1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
- 2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
- 3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:

Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Weight for Goal 1	Weight for Goal 2	Weight for Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30

2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for Western Michigan University. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY

0

2015 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE

2015 Performance Category & Phase


SATISFACTORY

0

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Western Michigan University



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates

Abbreviated SURV on this report

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores

Abbreviated EFF on this report

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who

received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs.

To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:




Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Weight for Goal 1	Weight for Goal 2	Weight for Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30

2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for Wayne State University. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY:  Highest  Mean  Lowest

2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY

0

2015 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE

2015 Performance Category & Phase


SATISFACTORY

0

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Wayne State University



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates

Abbreviated SURV on this report

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores

Abbreviated EFF on this report

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who

received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs.

To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:

Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Weight for Goal 1	Weight for Goal 2	Weight for Goal 3
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30